

## Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-14 are pending.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION – TITLE

The title of the invention was objected to as not descriptive. Applicants have amended the title to be more descriptive. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

### OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION – INFORMALITIES

The specification was objected to because of an informality. Specifically, on page 4, line 21, “interpreter 111” should be --interpreter 114--. Applicants have amended the specification as suggested in the Office Action. Accordingly, Applicants request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,303,336 issued to Kageyama, et al. (*Kageyama*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,141,681 issued to Kyle (*Kyle*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-3 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* and *Kyle*.

Claim 1 recites:

providing unformatted data having an associated tag indicating a type of formatting to be used to said viewing entity, said data comprising

one or more unformatted data portions to be converted into a format viewable to said viewer;

providing, together with the unformatted data portions, a plurality of formatters for said viewer, each of which is capable of formatting one or more of said unformatted data portions into said format viewable to said viewer;

locating said formatters by said viewer for each of said unformatted data portions based, at least in part on the associated tag, said formatters plug-able into said viewer; and

formatting each of said unformatted data portions by said located formatters to said format viewable to said viewer.

Thus, Applicants claim use of a tag associated with unformatted data that indicates a type of formatting to be used by a formatter.

*Kageyama* discloses a printing system in which terminals are connected to a print server for printing document data via a network. *Kyle* discloses a data transfer system that includes a first computer to generate a data package having a data portion and an instruction portion and a second computer to receive the data package and process the data portion in accordance with the instruction portion. However, neither *Kageyama* nor *Kyle* disclose or suggest providing unformatted data with an associated tag that indicates a type of formatting to be converted into a format viewable by the viewer and providing a plurality of formatters plug-able into the viewer together with the unformatted data portions. These limitations are recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that no combination of *Kageyama* and *Kyle* renders claim 1 obvious.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2 and 3 are not anticipated by *Kageyama* and *Kyle* for at least the reason set forth above.

Claims 11-14 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Kageyama*. Claims 12-14 depend from claim 11. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 11-14 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama*.

Claim 11 recites:

conversion means for converting said unformatted data portions into a format viewable to said viewer, said conversion means being separately located from said viewer;

identifying means for identifying each of said unformatted data portions; and

locating means for said viewer to locate, using said identifying means, said conversion means for each of said unformatted data, wherein the conversion means is selected based, at least in part, on contents of a tag associated with said unformatted data portions indicating a type of formatting to be used for said unformatted data portions.

Thus, Applicants claim locating conversion means selected based on a tag associated with unformatted data.

As discussed above, *Kageyama* discloses a printing system in which terminals are connected to a print server for printing document data via a network. *Kageyama* does not disclose conversion means that are separately located from the viewer for converting said unformatted data portions into a format viewable to the viewer where the conversion means are selected based on a tag. Therefore, *Kageyama* cannot teach or suggest the invention of claims 11-14

Claims 6-8 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Kageyama* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,511,156 issued to Nagasaka (*Nagasaka*). Claims 7, 8 and 10 depend from claim 6. For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 6-8 and 10 are not rendered obvious by *Kageyama* and *Nagasaka*.

Claim 6 recites:

providing unformatted data to each of said viewers, said unformatted data including a plurality of unformatted data portions having associated tags indicating a type of formatting to be used;  
providing a plurality of formatters, each of which is capable of formatting one or more unformatted data portions into at least one format viewable to at least one of said viewers;  
locating by each viewer, for each unformatted data portion to be viewable to said viewer, a formatter capable of converting said each unformatted data portion to a format viewable to said viewer; and  
formatting said each unformatted data portion by said located formatter to said format viewable to said viewer.

Thus, Applicants claim use of a tag associated with unformatted data that indicates a type of formatting to be used.

As discussed above, *Kageyama* discloses a printing system in which terminals are connected to a print server for printing document data via a network. *Nagasaka* discloses an interpreter for rasterization processing to obtain printing picture element information. Neither *Kageyama* nor *Nagasaka* discloses providing unformatted data having associated tags indicating a type of formatting to be used to each of the viewers and providing a plurality of formatters to convert the unformatted data to a format viewable by each of the viewers. Therefore, Applicants submit that no combination of *Kageyama* and *Nagasaka* renders claims 6-8 and 10 obvious.

#### CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-3, 6-8 and 10-14 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

Application No. 09/521,723  
Amendment dated September 21, 2004  
Response to Office Action of April 21, 2004

Atty. Docket No. 02471 (42390.P8970)  
Examiner Poon, King Y.  
TC/A.U. 2624


application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit

Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date:

SEPT 21, 2004

  
Paul A. Mendonsa  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with  
the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient  
postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

21 SEPTEMBER 2004

Date of Deposit

DEBORAH L. HIGHAM

Name of Person Mailing Correspondence



Signature

9-21-04  
Date